WORDS OF RECONCILIATION.

VOL. I.] JULY, 1885. [NO. 7.

DRUMMOND'S "NATURAL LAW IN THE SPIRITUAL WORLD."

Few books of recent date have attracted more attention and been more widely read than this. It was an added pleasure, upon reading it, to find clear and strong statements of some distinctive truths to which we had been testifying for years. Any one who has read "the Mystery of Creation and of Man" will see that some of its leading ideas correspond with those of this book, although Prof. Drummond's wider readings in the field of Science enables him to state them with a freshness and felicity of illustration to which we can make no claim.

We do not propose to enter upon any extensive review of this book. We shall call attention to but one of its principal features, and point out also one of its defects.

1. The argument of the book culminates in the chapter on "Eternal Life." Its leading proposition is that eternal life is not a mere perpetuation of existence. It is life of a new and higher order, and from a new source. "He that hath the Son hath Life, and he that hath not the Son hath not Life." But in elaborating this argument the author contributes a powerful support to that view of human destiny known in our day as the theory of conditional immortality. He appears, indeed, now and then to shrink from what is called "Annihilationism." (pg. 117.)

But his whole argument is without force except as it bases itself upon this fundamental principle, that there is no immortality or eternal life for man except as he receives this as a new gift from God through Christ. The reading of the whole chapter on "Eternal Life" will confirm this. We have room for but one or two brief extracts.

"The theory of Christianity is not that thought, volition, or emotion, as such are to survive the grave. The difficulty of holding a doctrine in this form, in spite of what has been advanced to the contrary, in spite of the hopes and wishes of mankind, in spite of all the scientific and philosophical attempts to make it tenable, is still profound. There is no secular theory of personal continuance, as even Butler acknowledged, which does not equally demand the eternity of the brute . . . When we turn, on the other hand, to the doctrine of Christ, we find ourselves in an entirely different region . . . Instead of attaching immortality to the natural organism, He introduces a new and original factor which none of the secular, and few even of the theological theories, seem to take sufficiently into account. To Christianity, he that hath the Son of God hath Life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life. This, as we take it, defines the correspondence which is to bridge the grave. This is the clue to the nature of the Life that lies at the back of the spiritual organism. And this is the true solution of the mystery of Eternal Life." (pg. 227.)

On page 236 he quotes approvingly a remark from Reuss that the apostolic doctrine of immortality is one which "far surpasses any that has been expressed in the formulas of the current philosophy or theology, and resting upon premises and conceptions altogether different. In fact, it can dispense with the philosophical thesis of the immateriality or indestructibility of the human soul, as altogether foreign to the religion of the Bible."

These quotations sufficiently show the drift of the au-

thor's thought upon this subject. His book, therefore, will exert a powerful influence in favor of the growing tendency to abandon the old doctrine of the inherent immortality of the human soul, and to substitute for it the view that Eternal Life reaches us only as we come into union with Christ, the source of it.*

There is a growing conviction among thoughtful Christians that Sin is necessarily self-destructive. No organism in which Sin resides can have in it the elements of perpetuity. *Death*, therefore, must be the final end of incorrigible sinners. This view best accords with the dictates of reason, the facts of science, and the words of Scripture. This book will greatly strengthen this conviction. We accept, without hesitation, the primary proposition of this doctrine of "Eternal Life only in

* An evidence of the increasing favor with which this view is regarded is seen in the recent election of the Rev. Edward White, the foremost representation of it in Great Britain, to the Presidency of the Congregational Union of England and of Wales. It is not to be denied that this view contributes a very important element to the complete doctrine of man's destiny. We shall mistake, however, if we suppose that it furnishes sufficient basis for the whole of it. There is too much yet to be learned, both from Science and from Revelation, concerning Man's place in Creation, for us to be dogmatic here. We suspect that there is a still undiscovered path of reconciliation between the prevalent view of man's inherent immortality and the doctrine of immortal life in Christ alone. It will very likely be found in the admission on the one hand, that no life, out of Christ, can abide forever, and, on the other, that, as all men have received life from the Spirit of God, an immortal Spirit dwells in all and strives in all to lift them out of the animal condition into one which is spiritual and eternal. But this divine Spirit creates for itself an *abiding* habitation only in those who yield to it and in whom Christ is formed. Only such come into the personal consciousness of a divine Sonship and into an individual possession of this eternal life. From this point of view we may regard man as a creature in whom an immortal Spirit dwells, but not as yet himself a spiritual being endowed with immortality. For this high rank of being he is as yet only a candidate. See Genesis vi; 3, R. V.

Christ." We part company with it, however, in its usual explanation of the meaning and scope of the promised resurrection of the dead. Scripture teaches that such is the relation into which the Christ has come to all mankind, and such the nature of His redeeming work, that He has procured a renewed gift of life for all. This cannot be Eternal Life to such as die in their sins. Their resurrection does not lift them above the region of judgment and liability to a second death. And yet, as it is the result of redemption, it must bring with it some possibility of future good. It cannot be solely for retributive ends. For the condition out of which the unjust are raised is essentially the retributive condition. The doctrine therefore of "Life in Christ" while essentially true, becomes an error if pushed to the point of the denial of any future life except for a limited class of saints. Before all there is a life beyond the grave. Not, however, an eternal life, but one which may end in a second death. And it is an error also to assume that this gift of life is only a torment and curse to all who are not saved in this life. The same judging and redeeming Christ reigns in all the realms of Life. And therefore both judgment and redemption must follow it through the future stages of its manifestation. It is with pleasure that we observe a distinct recognition of this principle in a recent Symposium article by the Rev. Edward White. He there puts himself in advance of other less distinguished advocates of the doctrine of "Life in Christ," and on to ground where many who have more or less sympathy with his views, but who have been standing aloof, may become reconciled. His language is:

"Man is a fallen but redeemed creature. Towards him God has purposes both of mercy and judgment. His eternal life includes both body and soul, and both are rendered immortal only through the power of the Divine Christ—by the Holy Spirit—a prospect restricted to those who are born of God. But the spirits of all mankind survive in the first death, either for purposes of awful judgment and retribution; or in many cases, probably (1 Peter iii: 18), for purposes of further education and salvation. The instinct of survival is in various forms, therefore, very widely diffused, and is misinterpreted only when it is converted into argument for the natural and absolute immortality of all souls."

This extract does not fully express our own views. It confuses processes of divine dealing which pertain to the resurrection state with those which characterize the intermediate state. The disembodied state itself is retribution. It is the resurrected state which puts the creature again in the line of discipline and possible salvation. And yet we are pleased to notice it as a "word of reconciliation" between theories of human destiny heretofore regarded as irreconcileable. And so also we welcome this work of Prof. Drummond, as not only a brilliant defence of Christianity from the ground of inexorable Natural Law, but as also preparing the way for a view of human destiny, which is sure to come, better than that which views each individual man as inherently immortal and hence capable, if destitute of Christ, of suffering through countless ages the agony of an endless hell. His argument throughout tends to remove from beneath this doctrine all basis of Scriptural support, in that it makes the wages of sin to be *death*, and denies to men an eternal life, except as they receive it as a gift from God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

2. But connected with this excellence in the book there is a serious defect. It lies in the meagre view the author takes of redemption. The argument moves so much in the region of inexorable *law* as to leave little place for the gospel. And hence in answer to the question, "Are there few that be saved?" the answer this book compels is "Yes, there are but few." Among its closing sentences we read as follows:

"The broad impression gathered from the utterances of the Founder of the Spiritual Kingdom is that the number of organisms to be included in it is to be comparatively small. The outstanding characteristic of the new Society is to be its selectness. "Many are called," said Christ, "but few are chosen." And when one recalls, on the one hand, the conditions of membership, and, on the other, observes the lives and aspirations of average men, the force of the verdict becomes apparent. . . . The analogy of Nature upon this point is not less striking—it may be added—not less solemn. It is an open secret, to be read in a hundred analogies from the world around, that of the millions of possible entrants for advancement in any department of Nature, the number ultimately selected for preferment is small. Here also "many are called, few are chosen." The analogies from the waste of seed, of pollen, of human lives, are too familiar to be quoted . . . . A comprehensive view of the whole field of Nature discloses the fact that the circle of the chosen slowly contracts as we rise in the scale of being . . . . *Quantity decreases as quality increases.*"

This will illustrate our meaning when we say that throughout the book the author is so hampered by fidelity to its leading purpose, which is to state the operations of God in the spiritual world in such terms of law as define for us His operations in the world of Nature, that he overlooks the fact that there are features of the *gospel* which cannot very well be stated in terms of *law*. They

are not indeed opposed to law. Indeed we believe there are deep laws in Nature by which she redeems and restores even where she seems to leave Death master of the field. And therefore it is with some surprise, as well as regret, that we miss from this otherwise splendid argument those analogies which one so well acquainted with Nature might easily have drawn between the redeeming processes in these two realms. The Natural world is certainly not destitute of prophetic forecasts of the gospel. Nature is all the time and everywhere repairing blight and defects, removing ugliness and deformity, turning decay into beauty, throwing off excrescences, improving the type, evolving higher forms, raising living forms out of corruption, and bringing life out of death. Her waste and worthless forms are never lost. They are wrought over. It may be said indeed the individual perishes in the process. So it does in the lower types of life. But in the higher human type this analogy must fail, because in man we reach that point in the development of life where it touches and is linked in with the life of God. If our knowledge of Natural law cannot enable us to bridge this gap, it yet suggests enough analogies to show that it can be spanned. While revelation shows that it has been forever bridged by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

This potential fact, which our author with us confesses, is prophetic of a far wider reach of redeeming grace and power than he conceives of in his closing chapter. He places before us such a picture of redemption as leaves this grand Universe crowned with but a few of "the fittest" who survive to reach the summit. And therefore we decline to rest in the conclusion to which he leads us, and turn with joy and gratitude to the conclusion the

Bible gives. It closes indeed with solemn forebodings of an inexorable destruction of all low and evil types of life and character out from the holy city of God's abode. But it also tells us of a multitude which no man can number, outside the first-fruits company of chosen ones; and of "nations" outside the city, who yet walk in its light and bring their glory and honor unto it. What if Prof. Drummond's chosen few be after all not the only company of the saved, but a special company, chosen as channels of blessing to many more who do not reach their height, but to whom they shall reach down a helping hand, and who, first saved, become the saviours of others? What if his view of the kingdom of God be right in but this aspect of it, in that few rise to its princely dignities as heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, and yet wrong, in that he supposes that only kings can constitute a kingdom? A kingdom must have subjects. It must make room for all ranks and degrees of life below the highest. Prof. Drummond's view is right only as it takes in one order of saved ones and that the highest. It is this defect which accounts for the striking contrast between his surviving few and the redeemed hosts as seen by St. John. And therefore we are forced to admit either that his study of Natural Law has not been able to tell him everything about the spiritual world, or else that there are regions of its operation which he has not yet explored.

THE "New Theology" is justly open to the criticism that its eschatology is negative. It needs a positive basis for the better doctrine at which it hints, but which it fails to supply. Such a basis is furnished in the right view of resurrection as *redemptive*.

STUDIES IN THE BIBLE.

REDEMPTION THROUGH RESURRECTION.

The Lord's triumph over His enemies would be fruitless did it not require and issue in a triumph over death. Hence He must judge also this last enemy. He must rescue His captive people who have been carried away as prisoners into his realm. The Bible was written to reveal this grace of God in providing redemption for man, the first fruits of which he now receives, but whose full results are achieved on the other side of death. Hence, if our view of the Old Testament promises is not carried forward to this point, we shall fall short of their meaning. Failure to give this principle its full value is a main cause of those mistifying and minifying glosses, which, under the specious plea of "spiritual sense," have so obscured the true meaning of God's Word, that multitudes have been led to doubt whether it is indeed His Word. A sad proof of the blinding effect of this process is the fact that "the hope of the resurrection of the dead" which God gave to the fathers, (Acts xxvi: 6,) and of which all His holy prophets testify to those who have ears to hear, is taken out of a multitude of passages, in which it is embedded as the hidden kernel, and robbed of which, they lose their chief value.

Old Testament passages which speak directly of judgment to be executed upon this last enemy are the following: "He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and

the rebuke of His people shall He take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it." (Ish. xxv: 8.) The whole background of the portion of Isaiah's prophecy on which this splendid promise is projected is one of judgment.

Hosea's prophecy is also burdened with premonitions of wrath to come, especially upon Ephraim, the schismatic kingdom of Israel. The issue of these judgments would be death to a great portion of the people. But in the wonder working of God the pains of death become the pangs of parturition.* The prophet foresees "the breaking forth of children," and exclaims in Jehovah's name, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave (sheol); I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction; repentance shall be hid from mine eyes." † (Hosea xiii; 14.) This promise explains that given in verse 9. "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thy help." The ultimate issue of Israel's self destruction was death. The grave covered all his hopes. But Jehovah who kills also makes alive. The honor of his name, His

---

* This figure occurs also in Ish. xxvi; 17, 18, before a promise of resurrection.

† The readiness of interpreters to eliminate resurrection teaching from the plainest Old Testament passages is illustrated by a late writer in the Andover Review, (Nov. 1884.) After adopting an unusual and infelicitous rendering of the above passage, in face of the fact that the Lxx. and St. Paul, in his free quotation of it, (1st Cor. xv: 55) endorse the obvious view of it, he maintains that it teaches the very opposite. His argument that such an outburst of promise is out of place in the midst of a context which speaks only of judgment amounts to nothing. The prophets abound in such instances. One is found indeed in this very chapter, and in the closest proximity to the passage in question. (vs. 9, 10.)

gracious convenant, required that not even death itself should remove His people beyond His power to help. And so He rises to the dignity of this exultant promise to ransom His people even from the power of Sheol. It is a just principle that a great and luminous promise like this sheds light upon the interpretation of all others of its class. There is a large class of these passages which speak of redemption from death, individual and national. And many, which promise deliverance to the captives, and the opening of prison doors to them that are bound, reveal their deepest meaning only as we view them as looking forward to a ransom from captivity to death. The name of Egypt (Mitzraim in Hebrew) signifies the "place of straitness." It thus furnishes a suitable type for the empire of Death. And redemption from its bondage stands out upon the pages of Scripture as a primal type of Jehovah's redemption of His people from Sheol.*

We have before seen (Ch. IV.) that the dead in Sheol are viewed as prisoners, (Job iii.: 18.) shut up by bars in the pit. (xvii: 16.) The righteous, however, did not expect to remain there, "But God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol; for He shall receive me." (Ps. 49: 15.) In Psalm lxxxviii: 10–12, we hear the sighing of these prisoners. "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall the dead (rephaim) arise and praise thee? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave? or thy

* It is interesting to trace through the old Testament its use of the term "captivity." It will be seen that it often describes a worse than human bondage; and that the promise to Israel and to other nations to "cause their captivity to return and to have mercy upon them," (Jer. xxxii: 7, 11, 26: xlix: 6, 39.) implies more than redemption from human slavery. It looks forward to their ransom from the power of Sheol.

faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" Psalm lxxix: 10, 11, is a prayer that God would avenge Himself upon the heathen who had filled His land with slaughter and requite the blood of His servants. "Let the sighing of the prisoners come before thee; according to the greatness of thy power preserve thou the children of death." (margin.) So wide-spread was the work of death in this case that no vindication of Jehovah's name and people would suffice that did not provide for triumph, not only over their human enemies, but over death. He must hear the sighing of its prisoners and loose their bonds. That this is the ultimate deliverance sought is apparent from Ps. cii. The prophet declares that Jehovah will hear the prayer of the destitute and appear in glory to build up Zion. "This is written for a generation to come; and the people which shall be created shall praise the Lord." (vs. 18.) This coming generation, a people to be created for the Lord's praise, seems to be the resurrected *children of death* (vs. 20, margin) spoken of afterwards. "For He hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary; from heaven did the Lord behold the earth; *to hear the groaning* of *the prisoner:* to *loose the children of death;*" to declare the name of the Lord in Zion, and His praise in Jerusalem." We are well aware that interpreters may readily reduce the meaning of such passages down to the low level of "things present" and deny that they refer at all to that transcendent order of things of which the resurrection of Christ was the pledge. But we are quite sure that any one who accepts that great fact as the focal point

toward which all the lines of God's working in the past converge, and from which they sweep away into the ages to come, will not accept any interpretation of such expressions in the Psalms and Prophets which does not view them as looking forward 1. to the Messiah's victory over death; 2, to the rescue of His people from its bondage, and 3, to an ultimate recovery of the generations of mankind who have gone down as prisoners into its realm.

Bondage in Egypt, captivity in Babylon and among all nations, stands out, no doubt, on the foreground of such passages. There is also a hidden reference to the spiritual darkness and bondage into which the people had fallen by reason of their sins, and a promise of quickening from this spiritual death. But the deliverance promised would be no message of mercy to the men to whom it was spoken, it would not meet the case, it would not execute the judgment written against all God's enemies, nor vindicate the honor of His name, did not these prophecies look forward to the ransom from Sheol of these very generations of men whom the wrath of their enemies and the justice of God had consigned to its gloomy prison.

The 68th Psalm is a glowing anticipation of this deliverance by one who ascends on high, *leading captivity captive*, and obtaining "gifts for men, yea for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them." (vs. 18.) "He that is our God is the God of salvation, and unto God the Lord *belong the issues of death.*"* (The out-

* Conant translates "God is to us a God for deliverances and to Jehovah he Lord belong *ways of escape from death.*"

goings of death.—*Young.*) This Lord over death shall "wound the head of his enemies," and bring again His people from Bashan, and from the depths of the sea. (vs. 21, 22.) Bashan was a region on the further side of Jordan, type of death. That this deliverance is more than that of an elect renemant, or even of the nation of Israel, is manifest from the scope of the whole Psalm, which celebrates a salvation for which all the kingdoms of the earth are invited to sing praises unto God. (vs. 32.)

These promises of deliverance are both personal and national. Psalm cxlii is a resurrection Psalm, to be understood first of the Messiah, but also of those in whose behalf He went down to death. The writer expresses his confidence that while no man "sought after his soul," (vs. 4, margin.) the Lord would be His portion in the land of the living *and bring out his soul from prison.*(vs. 7.) In Psalm cxliii, we hear the same complaint, "For the enemy hath persecuted my soul, he hath bruised my life to the earth; hath caused me to dwell in dark places as the dead of old." (vs. 3.—*Young's Translation.*) We have the cry for deliverance, "Hear me speedily, O Lord: my spirit faileth: hide not thy face from me, for I am become like unto them that go down into the pit." (vs. 7, margin.) "Cause me to hear thy loving kindness in the morning (the time of awakening) for in thee do I trust." And then we have the confident expectation; "For thy name's sake, O Lord, thou wilt quicken me; in thy righteousness thou wilt bring my soul out of distress. In thy loving kindness thou wilt cut off mine enemies, and will destroy all the adversaries of my soul: for I am thy

servant." (vs. 11, 12, see *Young's* and *Conant's* versions.) Psalm cxvi. records a similar experience, "Compassed me have the cords of death and the straits of Sheol have found me: Distress and sorrow I find, and in the name of the Lord I call: I pray thee, O Lord, deliver my soul . . . . for thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, my feet from over-throwing. I walk* habitually before the Lord in the land of the living." (vs. 3–9, *Young*.) Whatever application these words may have to release from spiritual death, verse 15 makes it clear that the ultimate deliverance in view is from death in Sheol. For this must be the "death of His saints" which remains "precious in the eyes of the Lord," and rescue from this the reason for the thanksgiving, "Thou hast loosed my bonds." (vs. 16.)

Without denying then that such passages, which abound in the Psalms, may be properly applied to spiritual quickening, for these two forms of death are one in essence, we are sure that their ultimate and highest meaning is seen only as they speak to us of resurrection.

THERE is but one immortal Spirit in the Universe, the Spirit of God. He rules or abides in man. (Gen. vi: 3. R. V.) The Spirit of God may build up in man a permanent habitation, and so become one with man in unity of being, making him a partaker of the divine nature. Man then becomes inherently immortal. But he is not born so. The fact that all men live after death does not prove that their life will be *eternal*. Eternal life is the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

* By a common Hebrew idiom the future is viewed as present.

MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS.

THE SECOND ADVENT.

From "*Old and New Theology*," by the Rev. J. B. Heard, we extract the following.

"It is at this point that we begin to see the light which the Lord's Second Advent throws on this perplexing problem. At present, for failure of proof of His resurrection, not so much on the historical side as the experimental, the world, Jewish and Gentile alike, stands in doubt and waits. But the balance which now inclines against faith might easily be righted, and it will be at His glorious appearing. His second epiphany will be a manifestation, not to a few shepherds, but before the eyes of the whole world, of that spiritual power which at His appearing will overcome the last lingering doubts of the world. Too many are still in the position of some of the five hundred to whom He appeared on a mountain of Galilee, and who still doubted. We cannot say how the last mists of doubt will be dispersed. All that we insist on is that there will be such a manifestation to sense so decisive that the balance, as in Thomas's case, will be set right. We know that the blessedness of those who only believe when they can see, can never equal that of those who, having not seen, yet have believed. This is the distinction, as we suppose, between God's elect and those who are only His saved but not His elect children. But we know that if the first-fruits are holy, so also the lump is afterwards to be holy.

On these grounds we see the purpose of the Second Advent, and what a lift in the direction of faith it is intended to effect. In a sense, Christ's resurrection is incomplete until He has manifested Himself in His resurrection glory to all men. Hence it was that He appeared to His apostles one by one, and last of all to the Apostle Paul as to one born out of due time. But the world waits for this supreme demonstration to sense, and for want of this crowning evidence the flesh prevails against the spirit, and some are scoffers and some are sceptics. All that is called Secularism by one class, or Agnosticism by another, will go on unchecked during this dispensation, and instead of the church prevailing against it, as earnest revivalists of all schools desire, this sceptical temper is likely to prevail against the churches. For why? The drift of Science, and also the drift of modern Philosophy, is all in a direction opposed to spiritual truth. As for science, instead of limiting herself to mere quantitative conceptions, as it is her duty to do, she makes a false alliance with what she calls philosophy, and sets up some half truth of mere evolution from lower forms of animal life as the whole account of man's being. Man is, as we admit, half-God, half-brute. But science takes the half for the whole. Philosophy in our day is only too content to take these idols of science, and set them up for its gods . . . . It is trying to make such phrases as the Infinite and the Absolute do duty for the living God, who is both Father and King. All this is melancholy to those who see to the bottom of this reigning unbelief. It is all the more melancholy because even the churches do not see the extent of the mischief. They are so intent

on their dogmas that they do not understand that one idol never had power to cast out another . . . . Escape there is none from deadly descent down the steep of Secularism. It is only when the age has rushed violently down this abyss of unbelief that it will discover what it ends in. They will see that Secularism is only the swine's philosophy, and must have a swinish ending . . . . But soon it will be otherwise, and for this reason the Church, which has failed to convince the world by the Lord's first Advent, falls back as her last reserve of power on the hope of the Second Advent. The coming of Christ with power will result in the victory of the spirit over the flesh . . . . We do not suppose that souls quickened only in this way can ever rise to the same heights of holiness as the elect of this dispensation. All flesh is not the same flesh,—in the same way there are spirits who are of the first-born, the hundred and forty four thousand who are virgins and who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. But besides these there are the great multitude which no man can number. Clearly, then, Multitudinism has a dispensation or Aeon of its own, as Particularism has in the present. The age of the Church is the dispensation of the elect, but the age which is to follow after the Lord's second coming is to be the dispensation of the multitude, the saved nations."

"THE DEEDS DONE IN THE BODY."

In a monograph upon the "Eschatology of the Future," published as an Appendix to "The Mystery of Creation and of Man," we make use of the passage 2d

Cor. v: 10, to prove that "our future embodiment must gather up and perpetuate the consequences of previous deeds," in accordance with the harvest-law, "To every seed his own body." As this passage is constantly quoted in proof of the doctrine that the condition of every man is everlastingly fixed at death, it becomes a matter of great importance to determine precisely its meaning. A correspondent, who was disposed to question our use of it, as above, has kindly sent us the results of his examination of the commentators.

"I find that the following names agree that the *σῶμα* of the text signifies the present body, and that the force of "*κομίσηται . . τὰ δια τοῦ σώματος*" is that there shall be a reception of awards according to the deeds which are done through the instrumentality of the present body. Those taking such a view are Dean Alford, Dr. Waite (in Speaker's commentary), Lange, Neander, Pool (Annotations), Dr. Pusey, Dr. Hodge, Bishop Wordsworth and Olshausen.

"Lange says, however, that Tertullian, Theodoret, Chrysostom, and Oecumenius, take the "body" in the text to designate the body which shall be raised, or rather the body when it is raised.

"Now Olshausen, while taking the words of the text literally to mean 'receive the things done by the body (as the instrument),' yet says the Apostle implies that the deeds done in this present body shall influence the condition of the future body, and that hence we may *supply* *ἐν τῷ σώματι* after 'receive,' which would give the following force. 'That each one may receive (in his resurrection body) the results of his actions which have been done through the instrumentality of the present body.

"Hence it seems to me that while I would hesitate to *translate* the words actually in the text as if they meant 'receive in the (resurrection) body according to his

earthly actions,' still I would be willing to *supply the thought* that the reception of rewards or punishments must influence the condition of the body as it rises from the dead."

A very good translation of the passage in question is that given in our English Bibles, provided the italic words, which the translators supply, are left out. It would then read, "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things in body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad." The Revised Version improves upon this by changing "appear" into "be made manifest."

There can be no question of course but that the deeds, for which men will be rewarded or punished, when they are "made manifest" before Christ's judgment seat, are those which were done in the body. They could not have been done any where else, or through any other instrumentality. But beyond this thought, which is not disputed, the literal Greek plainly asserts that men shall "receive through the body, according to the things they did." And therefore the thought that one's eternal future will be inexorably fixed by the deeds of this life is not the prominent thought of the passage. This may be true, but it is not the thing here asserted. Most modern commentators have read this meaning into the passage, because they coordinate it with the cardinal judgment-passage, Matt. xxv; 31–46: whereas that passage refers to a different class and a different scene. Its sentence, visited upon the wicked, is one which long precedes the resurrection. The Apostle here is speak-

ng of the judgment of the *saints*, which is not to determine the question of their salvation, but of their fidelity, and whose recompense should come to them at the resurrection of the just. "We" he says, "must all appear." He, himself, belongs to the class spoken of. We are not to suppose that Paul ever cherished a doubt of his salvation. To doubt this would be to deny his whole gospel. But he did often question his final acceptance as a faithful servant and steward. Hence his anxiety and labor to be "accepted of Him." (vs. 9.) Moreover, in harmony with other expressions of his, e. g. Phil. i: 20–23, iii: 7–14, he here turns forward not only to the fact of the resurrection life but to its *prizes*. And hence it is in accord with the whole drift of his thought in the chapter, as well as in literal harmony with his words in vs. 10, to suppose that he has reference to what he should receive *in body*, as the reward of his deeds. That reward would be woven into the fibres and stamped upon the features of the body with which he would then be "clothed upon."

Here, indeed, we meet with a prime law of life, which is also the law of its judgment. In no other sphere does the great harvest-law "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" assert itself more strongly. This is why evil-doers come forth to the "resurrection of judgment." (Jno. v: 29.) Their resurrection is a blessing, because it lifts them out of bondage to death. But it is also a judgment because evil character must impress itself upon embodiment. A degraded body may be made the vehicle of fearful punishment. It is so now. It may be so hereafter.

We believe, therefore, that the Fathers and older commentators, who found this meaning in 2d Cor. v; 10, were not only nearer the literal meaning of the words, but had a truer conception of the place and meaning of resurrection in God's great plan of life and of the world.

RECONCILIATION.

An Episcopal clergyman sends us the following:

"The sort of reconciliation which every true servant of Christ must desire, is a reconciliation or unification accomplished on no other basis but one in perfect harmony with all the great principles laid down in the New Testament.

"If, for example, the Society of Friends were to become absolutely co-extensive with the great body of believers, and perfect harmony were to prevail, we should see unity and uniformity, but with our present knowledge we perceive that in such a case there would be absolutely no witness borne to very many of the truths which God has condescended to reveal, no obedience to very many commands which he has enjoined. Far better a multitude of sects, with the whole truth distributed among them, than such a reconciliation as that.

"But what do we mean by a basis of union which shall be in harmony with all the great principles of the New Testament? Without stopping to enumerate all those great principles, will it not be admitted that they will include every plain injunction which Apostles delivered to the churches gathered under them? If some of those injunctions are to be listened to with respect, and others passed by, what rule shall determine our action in this regard? The Epistles themselves contain no hint of any such rnle. The alternative is *tradition.* But dare we use such a rule? Think what it implies: a plain unequivocal command addressed to Christian churches by an apostle of our Lord, is to be made of none effect by our traditions.

"But one says, 'No Christian in reality denies that all Apostolic injunctions, universal in their own day, are binding upon us; or if this may not perhaps be said of Romanists, yet *Protestants* know no other rule of faith than the Scriptures.' But let us judge *ourselves* in this matter. I take up at random some of the Apostolic commands. 'Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him.' Certainly it is not an universal custom that Christians lay by, every Sunday, offerings in definite proportion to their weekly earnings. Again, 'Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers.' Marriage with unbelievers is certainly discouraged, but is it universally forbidden?

"The above commands, however, are obeyed by many, so that God's way in his own house is not left altogether without witness. I find some injunctions, though, which none of the sects, and none of the historic churches, even pretend to obey. Take these: 1 Cor. xii. 31; xiv. 1, 12, 39. We are told to seek after the excercise of the miraculous gifts of prophecy and speaking with tongues. Do we obey? On the contrary, by utterly failing to obey, we lay ourselves open to the charge of 'despising prophesyings;' for if we did not despise them, would we not at least from time to time pray for them, knowing that God has said that He will give His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him, if they ask aright? The truth is that in spite of our endless confusions, we nevertheless think that we are better off in following the dictates of onr own understanding than in listening to and being guided by the living voice of the Holy Ghost in the ministry of the Christian prophet. If it were not so would we not be able now and then to find a prayer-meeting where there is actually prayer made for the restoration of the ministry of supernatural light and counsel? Would we not now and then find Christian ministers assembled in council asking the Lord to deliver them out of their preplexities by means of an ordinance which at the beginning met just such necessities, and which the Holy Ghost by St. Paul has commanded us *all* to desire and seek after?

The point of what I have said is this: That if we are looking after a basis of unity for Christian churches, we ought to discard any proposed basis which does not acknowledge the binding force of all

the Apostolic injunctions which were not subject to limitation in the days when they were uttered, refusing to make them of no effect through tradition ; and that, among other injunctions, we must not slight that oft-repeated one, to seek after the miraculous gift of prophecy. With that gift once restored and appreciated, we should have light on every dark subject ; God would Himself tell us how to become one again ; He would tell us where our additions to His laws have been made, and where we have overlooked what He has meant to teach us."

REMARKS.—It is impossible to deny the force of the above. In it the author goes down to the bottom of the evil which has produced dissension in the church. What he says also about the absence of that supernatural light and counsel given by the Holy Ghost in early times through the ministry of the prophets, and of utter indifference now to such guidance, as if we no longer needed it, is strongly put. We have never been able to see any good ground for the church's rejection of the principle, to which the followers of Edward Irving have borne a witness, that these gifts were designed to be permanent. In the present confusion there is surely need of them. And we fail to see any reason for their withdrawal, except that the church has proved herself to be an unworthy steward of this manifold grace of God. We can see no reason why Christians should not earnestly pray in public and in private for their restoration. Indeed we are quite sure that nothing short of a fresh and powerful effusion of the Holy Ghost will ever lift the church out of her low estate, and that the period of her renewed and abundant life will be marked by a plentitude of the gifts of which those first given were an earnest.

We have a growing conviction that there is an imper-

ative demand now for just such gatherings of Christians of every name, who yet own the One Name, to pray for such light and wisdom as we shall know to be a direct gift from the Lord Himself. We have been depending so long upon systems and traditions and the authority of great names, the founders and defenders of our several parties, that we need to get back directly to the Source of all wisdom, that we may get life and truth afresh from the living Fountain.

NOTES ON CURRENT OPINIONS AND EVENTS.

THE SOCIETY FOR ETHICAL CULTURE.—Prof. Felix Alder, of New York, gave a recent lecture in Philadelphia explanatory of what is called "The New Ethical Movement." He informed his hearers that the need for it arises from the fact that the old religions no longer furnish an adequate basis for moral culture. He laid down the following principles.—

1. Some more stable basis for morality is needed than the belief in God and in future rewards and punishments. The fact of duty remains the same whether there be a God or not. Some men do not and cannot believe, But they are none the less bouud by the law of reason to be upright and humane.

2. There must be progress in ethics. The conditions of human society have changed so much that Christianity furnishes no longer a sufficient scheme of ethics.

3. We must develop in men ethical culture through works of practical benefience.

4. Self-reform must go hand in hand with our efforts to reform society.

The address was plausible and forcible. But we were pained to reflect that its plea for a new system of Ethics would never have been made if Christianity were better understood and more

thoroughly applied. The lecture also illustrated the impotence and folly of all attempts to rule out from the minds of men the primary truths of religion. The lecturer himself was obliged to invent equivalents for these ideas and to bring them in under different names. Professing to be an Agnostic as to the idea of a God, he announced his belief in a "power that makes for righteousness." He said that the Suns and Stars in their courses are all moving toward the triumph of the good. He spoke of the necessity of our belief in its ultimate triumph and of man's duty to bring his life into harmony with the universal life. "We do not know," he said "that there is a personal pilot to the world-ship, but we do know that it is sailing toward the good."

What have we then, after all, in this new religion but a poor imitation of the old world-long faith in God? For the one God over all, whom Jesus taught us to call "Our Father," it substitutes a "power that makes for righteousness." For the inspiring conviction that "of Him and for him and to Him are all things," it gives us the vague assurance that all things are moving along under the reign of law toward better conditions. For the universal dominion of a Divine Man, our Elder Brother, over all the powers and forces of the Universe, the new faith makes the stars in their courses to move along, under the laws of motion and gravitation, we suppose, toward the universal good. Christian culture seeks to bring the lives of men into union with Him who is the Life of the world and in Whom its fullness dwells. The new Ethics invites us to harmonize our lives with the universal life. It erects a "law of duty" into a source of moral obligiation. The Christian affirms that this law of "oughtness" implies some one who has the right to say "You ought."

It is sad indeed to see men thus groping in ignorance of God and of Jesus Christ who came to reveal Him, and yet giving this unconscious testimony that they need Him, in that they are compelled to invent an idea of Him, which shall stand them instead of Him who is the true idea or image of the Invisible God.

This lecture stirred up within us a double desire: 1. That the church might be so cleared of defective apprehensions of truth, and be so filled with the Spirit of Christ that there would be no excuse

for false systems which offer themselves as substitutes on the ground of her confessed failures.

2. That God would hasten the day when this "face of the covering which the god of this world hath cast over all people," shall be taken away, so that the true glory of God as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ shall appear. "And it shall be said in that day, Lo! this is our God, we have waited for Him and He will save us. We will be glad and rejoice in His salvation."

General Gordon's Views.—We do not endorse all the sentiments contained in the following extract from the writings of this distinguished man as given in the *London Daily Telegraph.* His reaction against the dogma of endless torment seems to have carried him to the extreme of Universalism. And yet the extract is important, as showing that a man may be a devout student of the Word, and submissive to its teaching, and may possess the highest and most approved traits of Christian character, and yet reject those long accepted views of God, and of man's destiny under His moral government, which so many regard as essential to the faith. It would be well for us to admit that men may be taught of God to see things in His Word which have never found their way into our accepted creeds, and that men, loyal in heart to Christ, cannot be disloyal to His words, even when they seem to reject their surface meaning. Such men sometimes see beneath the surface what others fail to see.

"Nothing can be more abject and miserable than the usual conception of God. Accept what I say, viz.—that He has put us in a painful position to learn what He is, and that He will extricate us. Imagine to yourself what pleasure would it be to Him to burn us or to torture us. Can we believe any human being capable of creating us for such a purpose? Would it show His power? Why, He is omnipotent! Would it show His justice? He is righteous—no one will deny it. We credit God with attributes which are utterly hateful to the meanest of men. Looking at our darkness of vision, how can He be what we credit Him with? I quite wonder at the long time it has taken us to see that the general doctrine of the Church is so erroneous. When one thinks of the millions on whom weighs this

yoke of bondage one wonders. I do not know one single person who says this straight out. I say that Christian Pharisees deny Christ. They ignore Him, or at the most throw Him in as a make-weight. I see no resemblance to Him in them. When one thinks of the real agony one has gone through in consequence of false teaching, it makes human nature angry with the teachers who have added to the bitterness of life."

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

In reply to an honored clergyman of the Presbyterian church who believes that the use of the word "eternal" (Matt. xxv: 46,) as applied to both "life" and "punishment" is a fatal barrier to any hope that the punishment is terminable, and that if the one is endless, the other must be also, we have to say,

1. The meaning of the word αἰώνιον is confessedly disputed, and therefore it cannot, of itself, bear the weight of this tremendous doctrine of endless torment without the concurrent testimony of Scripture. We are not willing to go with Maurice, Westcott, and others, in their exclusion of the idea of *duration* from the word. We admit that it is often used in both classical and New Testament Greek as the equivalent of "endless." But every Bible student knows that this is not its uniform and necessary meaning. Young's version translates the word in this verse, and wherever it occurs in the New Testament, "age-during." All we can say concerning the word in this passage is that it does not *necessarily* teach that either the life, or the punishment is endless. We know from other sources that the life continues through the ages to come. But we are not shut out, by this word, from viewing the punishment as terminable, *provided other Scriptures require this view.*

2. Here lies the real question at issue. The radical question we have raised in this magazine relates to the meaning of large portions of the Divine Word, especially of The Old Testament. It is full of promises of future blessing to Israel and contemporaneous nations who where consigned to death and hell on account of their sins. It contains also many hints and some distinct declarations as

to the *mode* by which these promised blessings should reach them. It was to be through resurrection. Indeed there is no other way possible by which these promises can be fulfilled to these dead generations. Resurrection must therefore terminate the sentence by which they were consigned to death and hell. Their punishment, in this essential feature of it, cannot be then without limit. And that all our Lord's allusions to hell-fire are best explained as referring to a punishment inflicted before resurrection, we fearlessly assert.

A comparison of Scripture teachings require us to hold that during the "times of restitution of all things of which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began," the dead of mankind will be progressively raised, each in his own time and order, the redemption of Christ thus bringing to the world all, and more than, it lost in Adam. This resurrection, however, must be according to the harvest law of sowing and reaping.

Only those who have "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" have part in the resurrection to eternal life. All others come under the discipline and yoke which a lower grade of life and embodiment necessarily brings. Some may remain in hopeless bondage to evil. With many the second period of life ends in a second death. All this may be held, yea, must be held in connection with the great principle that resurrection restores to hell's captives a forfeited blessing. To deny this principle is to mutilate the Gospel.

It will be perceived then that we can not consent to put the meaning of a word (αἰώνιον) at the centre of this inquiry. It belongs on the circumference. It is an inquiry as to the meaning of resurrection in the great economy of redemption. If it were put beyond all doubt that the word in Matt. xxv; 46, means "endless," we would still be compelled to adjust the passage to this ruling idea of redemptive resurrection.

It is not at all essential to our view that we should be able to restrict this word. We can grant that the punishment here spoken of *may* be "endless." What then? It must still be such a punishment as will make room for God's promise of resurrection.

The word κολάσιν means "cutting off." The righteous are said here to inherit a kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of

the world. The wicked, notwithstanding resurrection, may be eternally cut off from this dignity and inheritance. We know that they must suffer an eternal loss. The opportunity for heirship in the kingdom is gone forever. They are sentenced by the King to an everlasting excision. But, if not inheritors, they may become subjects and vassals of the Kingdom, far removed from the King's presence. They may be made into vessels of earth for the great Father's house, if not vessels of gold; inferiors and menials where they might have been princes. Some such adjustment as this is possible without detracting in the least from the force of the word "eternal." All we claim is that the great principle of redemptive resurrection cannot be set aside by this disputed word.

We have never taught that this universal redemption to life is universal salvation. We have only denied that it means, for the large proportion of its beneficiaries, a binding over to an increased and everlasting torment.

To the same correspondent who, in another letter, avows his belief that any scheme which holds out any hope after death for our fellow-men who die in their sins is, "to the last degree perilous and pernicious," we would reply that if the "scheme" holds out a hope of a "reprieve" or of a delay in punishment until after another trial, then this would be pernicious. But what is the threatened punishment? We affirm it to be death and the outcast state in hell which is death's sequence and prolongation. This penalty is immediate and from it there is no possible escape. We teach, however, that there could be no resurrection from this death-state, unless the sentence were *exhausted*. Resurrection necessarily unlocks the prison doors for hell's captives. This is its meaning. It does not bring to the wicked eternal life. It does not break their bondage to sin. They come back to life, more or less weighted and crippled according to their deserts, and liable to a second death. That this gives them the renewed opportunities which inhere in a restored life is evident.

Whether it is perilous to teach this depends entirely upon its truth. It is commonly assumed that the fear of an endless hell is necessary to keep sinners within bounds. Practically and histori-

cally this exaggerated threat of doom defeats its own ends. Men generally do not believe in it. They cannot conceive of it. And so they very likely go to the other extreme and give up all idea of retribution. Or, still worse, they repudiate the Bible and the Christian system in which they believe such punishment is taught. The question is therefore whether the reasonable doctrine of a punishment in hell bounded by a hope of resurrection, but a hope deferred in proportion to the degree of sin, and the restored life crippled and hindered in proportion to the intensity of previous evil habits, if faithfully presented, would not have a greater effect in restraining men from sin than one which dazes and stupefies their moral sense, and which they cannot comprehend.

But not only is the moral power of the doctrine much over-estimated. Its spiritual power is naught. No man was ever drawn to Christ by the fear of hell. He may be restrained from vice, but not regenerated. Salvation consists in the fear and love of God. These are not produced in this way. Hence our preachers instinctively rely but little upon this kind of appeal.

No doctrine can be pernicious which is true. There are indeed pearls of truth which are not to be cast before swine. The Bible itself refers to esoteric truth, "secret things" which belong to God. (Deut. xxix : 29.) We confess to having hesitated, long after these truths were made plain to us from the study of the Word, about publicly teaching them, The considerations which led us to do so were,

1. The existing confusion into which the minds of men have fallen concerning the Bible teaching upon this subject. In the prevalent reaction from the old medieval view of future punishment-many are drifting to an opposite extreme and giving up all ideas of a wrath to come. The peril our correspondent fears is not one of our creation. It is here. And it can only be warded off by a reasonable doctrine of retribution. Men will not be much moved by a doctrine which violates their own sense of justice and impugns the character of God.

2. The old ideas, by presenting a distorted view of His character and ways, unfavorably affect Christian character. At its base lies the knowledge of God. Whatever perverts that knowl-

edge is essentially pernicious. Whatever presents it in its truest forms is eternal life to the soul. The men who speak of God to their fellows are bound by the very highest considerations, to be intellectually honest. No one side of truth or of the Divine character must be presented out of its proportions. It seemed to us therefore that a doctrine of human destiny needs to be brought out which shall harmonize what the Bible teaches concerning God both as love and as a consuming fire, which introduces no violent changes into His character and dealings, which makes Him unchanging from age to age, which makes room for both His promises of blessing to all the families of the earth, and His threats to turn all the nations that forget Him into hell, which presents Him as the Lord God, merciful and gracious, and yet who will by no means clear the guilty. Such a view of God and of His dealings runs all through the Bible. Judgment and Redemption, Love and Righteousness, are the parallel lines of truth, along which we are carried all through its pages. But, in the end and on the whole, light triumphs over darkness, mercy rejoices against judgment; good subdues evil. Life, not Death, Love, not Hate, Christ, not Satan, remain the final Masters in this system of the world. And the pledge of this final triumph is His resurrection from the dead to be the Lord of both the dead and the living. We have been led to see that not even death and hell can hold their captives forever against His redeeming power. If it be perilous and pernicious to assert this then it is so, not becausethe doctrine is foreign to the Word of God, but because it is inexpedient to make it known.

THE question as to "eternal punishment" narrows itself down to the meaning of these two words. Does κολάσις stand for simple retribution, or for a "cutting off" from life and from the kingdom, which to some at least may be corrective? And does αἰώνιον mean endless or "up to the time of resurrection?" The place and meaning of resurrection in the economy of Creation and redemption will in the end prove to be the determining factor in this controversy.